



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE *DE ORATORIBUS* *ANTIQUIS* OF DIONYSIUS

BY RALPH HERMON TUKEY

In his introduction to the *De oratoribus antiquis*, Dionysius declares that his ultimate purpose in writing the work is to assist in the grand movement of expelling the meretricious Asianism and restoring the true Attic style. To this end he promises to select from the Attic writers such authors as are best suited for the reader to copy, and to point out what elements in each are most worthy of imitation. The present work is to be devoted to orators: at another time, if opportunity is afforded, he will discuss the historians. Accordingly he selects from the field of oratory six representative men, and divides them into two groups according to the period in which they lived, the earlier group, comprising Lysias, Isocrates, and Isaeus to be treated in the first division (*σύνταξις*) of the work, and the later group, including Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Aeschines, in the second.

The first division with its essays on Lysias, Isocrates, and Isaeus has been preserved intact. We also have an essay on Demosthenes, which has come down to us under the title of *περὶ τῆς Δημοσθένους λέξεως*, and which in all the important manuscripts is separated from the group of essays on Lysias, Isaeus, and Isocrates by one or more of the other works of Dionysius. The scope and method of this essay differ materially from the plan that was outlined in the introduction to the *De oratoribus antiquis* and which was followed in the first division of that work. This wide divergence in treatment plainly separates it from the essays on Lysias, Isocrates, and Isaeus, and points to an independent origin. But on the other hand we have two undoubted references to this essay in other works of Dionysius which assign it to the *De oratoribus antiquis*. It is the purpose of the paper to present a hypothesis which reconciles these two facts and suggests a solution for certain other difficulties that are found in the extant essay on

Demosthenes. Briefly stated it is this, that Dionysius completed the *De oratoribus antiquis* according to his original plan and that afterward, for reasons which will appear later in the discussion, he wrote another essay on Demosthenes and incorporated it into the *De oratoribus antiquis*.

The first *σύνταξις*, which follows closely the plan outlined in the introduction, in its closing sentences renews the promise of a second part in which Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Aeschines should be discussed.¹ That this second part was actually completed and contained essays on the three later orators is made evident by the opening sentences of the essay on Dinarchus,² where Dionysius says that he did not include Dinarchus in his work on the Attic orators because he was "neither an inventor of a special type of style, as was Lysias, Isocrates, and Isaeus, nor was he a perfecter of the discoveries of others like Demosthenes, Aeschines, and Hyperides."³ If for any reason we assume that the second part was never written, or that it was left incomplete and did not include Aeschines and Hyperides, we take away the occasion for any explanation on the part of Dionysius with regard to his failure to treat Dinarchus in that work and leave this sentence without point or meaning. Furthermore, the detailed statements (quoted below) about the style of Hyperides which are found in the *De Dinarcho* indicate that Dionysius had worked out a systematic treatment of that author at least; and the manner in which they

¹ *De Isaeo* 124. 8. 629, ἐτέραν δὲ ἀρχὴν ποιήσομαι τοῦ λόγου περὶ τε Δημοσθένους καὶ Ὑπερίδου καὶ τρίτον λέγων Αἰσχίνου.

² The correctness of this conclusion seems to be generally admitted by those who have examined the passage. Cf. Blass *De Dionysii Halicarnassensis scriptis rhetoricis*, p. 11; Roessler *Dionysii Halicarnassensis scriptorum rhetoricorum fragmenta*, p. 8; Croiset *Histoire de la littérature grecque* V. 360, footnote; Egger *Denys d'Halicarnasse*, p. 30. Wilamowitz "Lesefrüchte," *Hermes* XXXIV. 626, seems to have overlooked this passage, and in fact to have given scant attention to the essay on Dinarchus; otherwise he would not have chided Dionysius so severely for lack of interest in Hyperides: "Hyperides lag dem Dionys dauernd fern. . . . Wir finden denn nirgend Spuren, dass er diesem Redner das verdiente Interesse zugewandt hätte."

³ περὶ Δεινάρχου τοῦ ῥήτορος οὐδὲν εἰρηκῶς ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων γραφεῖσιν διὰ τὸ μῆτε εὐρετὴν ἰδίῳ γεγονέναι χαρακτήρος τὸν ἄνδρα, ὥσπερ τὸν Λυσίαν καὶ τὸν Ἰσοκράτην καὶ τὸν Ἰσαῶν, μῆτε τῶν εὐρημένων ἐτέροις τελειωτήν, ὥσπερ τὸν Δημοσθένη καὶ τὸν Αἰσχίνην καὶ τὸν Ὑπερίδην. . . .

are introduced presupposes an acquaintance with such a treatment on the part of the reader.¹

From an examination of the references to these three orators in *De Dinarcho* and elsewhere in the works of Dionysius, we may hope to gain some idea of the contents of the second part. We may infer from the passage already quoted from *De Dinarcho*, that, as Lysias, Isocrates, and Isaeus each represented a particular style, so Demosthenes, Aeschines, and Hyperides were regarded as perfecters of three separate styles, or rather that the new elements introduced by each of the earlier orators were regarded as more highly developed or more skilfully combined with other qualities in the corresponding later orators. Such a correspondence is obvious in the case of Isaeus and Demosthenes, where the nascent *δεινότης* of Isaeus finds its perfect development in the more finished eloquence of Demosthenes.² *χάρις* is the common element in Lysias and Hyperides and the advance is made in the case of Hyperides by combining this quality with effectiveness (*χάριτος μεστός ἐστι· καὶ δοκῶν ἀπλοῦς οὐκ ἀπήλλακται δεινότητος*, *De imitatione* 213. 8. 435). That the two men were associated in the mind of Dionysius is shown by the following references: τοῦ δ' Ὑπεριδείου ταῖς τε οἰκονομίαις ἀκριβεστέρου καὶ ταῖς κατασκευαῖς γενναιοτέρου πῶς ὄντος τῶν Λυσιακῶν, *De Dinarcho* 304. 12. 640; ὁ δ' Ὑπερίδης κατὰ μὲν τὴν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἡττᾶται Λυσίου, κατὰ δὲ τὸν πραγματικὸν τρόπον διαφέρει, *ibid.*, 305. 11. 641; ὁ δὲ Ὑπερίδης εὖστοχος μὲν, σπάνιον δ' αὐξητικός· καὶ τῇ μὲν τῆς φράσεως κατασκευῇ, Λυσίαν ὑπερῆρκώς, τῇ δὲ τῆς εὐρέσεως πανουργία πάντας, *De imit.* 213. 3. 435. There is less material for establishing a similar relationship between Isocrates and Aeschines. No other mention is made of Aeschines in the essay on Dinarchus, and elsewhere in the works of Dionysius no comparison between the two men is found. But in the summary criticism of the more important Greek authors which appears in the epitome of the work on Imitation, the style of each is said to be *πομπικός* (*De imit.*

¹ Further evidence for the existence of an essay on Hyperides is found in the statement of a scholiast on Hermogenes (Walz *Rh. Gr.* VII. 1048): Διονύσιον, ὅς περὶ χαρακτῆρος διέλαβε Λυσίου Δημοσθένους Ἰσοκράτους Ὑπερίδου Θουκυλίδου.

² *De Isaeo* 123. 23. 628: ὅτι μοι δοκεῖ τῆς Δημοσθένους δεινότητος, ἣν οὐθεὶς ἐστὶν ὅς οὐ τελειοτάτην ἀπασῶν ὀλεται γενέσθαι, τὰ σπέρματα καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς οὗτος ὁ ἀνὴρ παρασχεῖν.

212. 3. 432 and 212. 19. 434), and *ἐναργής* (*ibid.* 212. 3. 432, and 213. 1. 434). The first-named quality is peculiar to each as compared with the other members of his group and may have served as a basis for associating the two men. We must not imagine that Dionysius attempted to find a perfect exemplification of the relation of inventor to perfecter in each of the three pairs of orators. According to the closing sentence of the essay on Isaeus, he conceived of the three men in the last group as possessing supreme excellence in the command of the rhetorical art and great effectiveness in real contests.¹ Naturally this was not equally true of all of the three men, nor were the two qualities mentioned present in each in the same relative degree. Aeschines evidently owed his prominence to the second of these qualities more than to the first.² In some respects he must have appeared at a disadvantage in the comparison with Isocrates, but, as Hyperides is said to surpass Lysias by reason of his combining charm and effectiveness, so Aeschines would overmatch Isocrates by reason of the fact that he, too, possessed the element of effectiveness in addition to the showy qualities of Isocrates (*πομπικὸς ἄμα καὶ δεινός*, *De imit.* 212. 19. 434).

We may perhaps go a little farther and attempt to reconstruct the essays in outline. In the essay on Hyperides, for example, there would be the usual opening chapter, giving a brief account of his life, which would be followed by an enumeration of his *ἄρεταί*. Then there would be a detailed comparison between Hyperides and Lysias in point of style (*λέξις*). In choice of words Hyperides is found to be inferior to Lysias (*De Din.* 305. 11. 641); his diction is more elaborate (*De imit.* 213. 4. 435) and less clear (*De Din.* 305. 9. 641). In the arrangement of words he resembles Lysias in simplicity but surpasses him in vigor (*De Din.* 306. 17. 643). The second half of the essay would contain a comparison between the two as regards subject-matter (*τὰ πράγματα*). In invention (*εὗρεσις*) Hyperides is found to surpass not only Lysias,

¹ *De Isaeo* 124. 9. 629: ἡ γὰρ δὴ τελειωτάτη ῥητορικὴ καὶ τὸ κράτος τῶν ἐναγωνίων λόγων ἐν τούτοις τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἔοικεν εἶναι.

² *De imit.* 212. 20. 434: καὶ οὐ πάνυ μὲν ἐντεχνος, τῇ δὲ παρὰ τῆς φύσεως εὐχερεῖα κεχορηγημένος.

who himself is very clever in this respect (*De Lysia* 25. 12. 486), but all the other orators as well (*De imit.* 213. 5. 435). In the discussion of the management of his material (*οἰκονομία*) Isaeus also would be introduced and we should be shown how Hyperides adopted and extended some of the innovations of Isaeus, e. g., in giving greater elaboration to the arguments (*De Din.* 305. 13. 641; cf. *De Isaeo* 95. 22. 590 and 111. 22. 612). The essay on Aeschines would follow a similar outline, using Isocrates for the main comparison and contrast.

The essay on Demosthenes¹ would give a more adequate statement of the relation of Demosthenes to Isaeus and to the other orators, and would correct the exaggerated notion of the importance of Isaeus which is conveyed by the *De Isaeo* when taken by itself.² In that essay Dionysius was anxious to establish a connection between Isaeus and Demosthenes, in order to justify the prominence that he gives Isaeus there by making him the subject of one of the essays in the series.³ For that reason he seized every pos-

¹The three lists of the six orators (*De or. ant.* 7. 17. 451; *De Isaeo* 124. 8. 629; *De Dinarcho* 297. 4. 629) agree in giving Demosthenes as first in the second group, which indicates that the essay on Demosthenes was the first in the second part of the *De oratoribus antiquis*. This position rather than that of last in the series was doubtless chosen because of his relation to Isaeus, who thus immediately precedes him. With reference to the other two orators the lists are divided. The two lists that antedate the second part place Hyperides second and Aeschines third but the later list gives Aeschines as second and Hyperides third. It is probable that the earlier lists give the order according to the original plan of Dionysius but that after the composition of the second part had been begun, the order was changed to that which appears in the later list. It would appear that the first arrangement was due to the fact that Aeschines' position among the later orators was somewhat analogous to that held by Isaeus among the earlier, in that his importance in the present work is due to his historical relation to Demosthenes as well as to his own merits as an orator. Cf. *De Isaeo* 123. 21. 628 and 124. 8. 629: τὸν δὲ δὴ **τρίτον** Ἰσαῖον εἰ τις ἔροιστό με τίςιν ἔνεκα προσεθέμην, Λυσίου δὲ ζηλωτὴν ὄντα, ταύτην ἂν αὐτῷ φαίην τὴν αἰτίαν, ὅτι μοι δοκεῖ τῆς Δημοσθένους δεινότητος . . . περὶ τε Δημοσθένους καὶ Ὑπερίδου καὶ **τρίτου** λέγων Ἀισχίνου. Here **τρίτον** seems to be an echo of **τρίτον** above, and carries with it some of the apologetic associations. But because of this very relation to Demosthenes it was found desirable to abandon the original order and to treat Aeschines in the essay immediately following that on Demosthenes. Dionysius followed the same order in his treatment of these orators in the *De imitatione*. The chiasmic arrangement is doubtless accidental.

²In *De Din.* 313. 21. 656; 320. 12. 666, and *De Dem.* 251. 5. 1127, Dionysius seems to refer to another work on Demosthenes which dealt largely with questions of chronology and authenticity, subjects which were only incidentally treated in the *De oratoribus antiquis*. Cf. *De Lysia* 22. 8. 481; 25. 3. 485; *De Isaeo* 94. 12. 589.

³Cf. *De Isaeo* 123. 21. 628. In the *De imitatione* Isaeus was omitted altogether and his place in Dionysius' canon of the Six Orators was given to Lycurgus.

sible opportunity to call attention to the features in which Isaeus resembled his great successor and deferred the more complete presentation of the sources of Demosthenes' eloquence until he should treat him in a separate essay. If the references to Demosthenes and Isaeus in the *De Dinarcho* reflect the views that were expressed in the lost essay on Demosthenes, which seems probable, Dionysius would there credit Isaeus with certain innovations which play an important part in the works of Demosthenes,¹ but regarded him as only one of a number of sources from which Demosthenes derived his training and inspiration.²

We still have the existing essay on Demosthenes to account for. Unfortunately a fragment containing the introduction has been lost; otherwise, the question of its position among the works of Dionysius might never have been raised. There is, however, in chap. xxxiii a restatement of a part of the lost introduction, which is important for our present purpose and has hitherto received too little attention. According to this passage the purpose of the essay was to show that Demosthenes possessed the best and most serviceable style for addressing all classes of men,³ surpassing in this respect not only the other orators but the philosophers as well.⁴ The presence of any introduction whatsoever would differentiate this essay from the essays on Lysias, Isocrates, and Isaeus, where the necessary information of that sort was provided in the general introduction to the whole work. But this introduction discloses a purpose which is foreign to that which was announced in the introduction of the *De oratoribus antiquis* and was evident in the essays in the first division of that work. There Dionysius declared that his immediate object in writing was to give assistance to those who were trying to form their style by the imitation of classic models, and it was from the standpoint of imitation that he discussed the three earlier orators. But in the

¹ *De Din.* 297. 1. 629; cf. *De Isaeo* 123. 24. 628.

² *De Din.* 305. 17. 642; cf. *Ad Amm.* 259. 11. 723; *De Dem.* 143. 11. 974.

³ *De Dem.* 202. 9. 1058: ἡ πρόθεσις ἦν μοι καὶ ἐπάγγελμα τοῦ λόγου, κρατίστη λέξει καὶ πρὸς ἅπασαν ἀνθρώπου φύσιν ἡρμοσμένη μετριώτατα Δημοσθένη κεκρημένον ἐπιδεῖξαι.

⁴ *Ibid.* 202. 16. 1059: ἀντιπαρθεὶς αὐτῇ τὰς τῶν ἄλλων ῥητόρων τε καὶ φιλοσόφων λέξεις τὰς κράτιστα δοκούσας ἔχειν.

De Demosthene his only concern is to establish the pre-eminence of Demosthenes—especially over Plato. There is now no reference to imitation and the work takes the form of argument rather than of exposition. Furthermore, the scope of his treatment is extended beyond the boundaries which were observed in the *De oratoribus antiquis*. There the discussion was confined strictly to the orators; but in this essay orators, historians, and philosophers are treated without apparent distinction, so far as it is a question of their relation to the subject under discussion.

Even more striking evidence of the independent origin of the *De Dem.* is found in the treatment of Isaeus in this essay. In the *De Isaeo* he was represented as having introduced the element, *δευότης*, which was the most characteristic feature of the oratory of Demosthenes, and frequent references were made to Demosthenes' indebtedness to him in other respects. But in the *De Dem.* he is mentioned but once and then as one of six writers who exhibit "nothing new or unusual."¹ It is highly improbable, to say the least, that such a statement would be found in this essay, if it had immediately followed *De Isaeo* as a part of the same series.

The underlying motive of the essay, as may be inferred from the controversial tone of some of its passages, is the refutation of what Dionysius regarded as extravagant claims of the advocates of Plato.² After the second part of the *De oratoribus antiquis* had been completed, the attention of Dionysius, we may suppose, was called to the fact that, while he had shown in that work that Demosthenes stood first among the orators, such pre-eminence did not preclude a representative of history or philosophy from being awarded the primacy in the whole field of prose literature. It was *to refute the claims of the advocates of Plato* that he then prepared this second essay on Demosthenes. Apparently we have here another chapter in that never-ending controversy between the

¹ *De Dem.* 143. 6. 974: Ἀντιφῶν γὰρ δὴ καὶ Θεόδωρος καὶ Πολυκράτης Ἰσαῖος τε καὶ Ζώϊλος καὶ Ἀναξιμένης καὶ οἱ κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς γενόμενοι τοῦτοις χρόνοις οὐθὲν οὔτε καινὸν οὔτε περιττὸν ἐπετήδευσαν. I shall later return to this passage and attempt to give its proper interpretation.

² *De Dem.* 178. 16. 1024: πρὸς δὴ τοιαύτας ὑπολήψεις καὶ τερατείας ἀνθρώπων ἡμιτελῶν περὶ λόγους, οἱ τὴν εὐγενῆ κατασκευὴν οὐκ ἴσασιν ἢ τίς ποτ' ἐστὶν οὐδὲ δύνανται, πᾶσαν εἰρωνεῖαν ἀφείλς, ὡς πέφυκα, διαλέξομαι.

partisans of rhetoric and those of philosophy. In the *Epistle to Ammaeus* he has already refuted the assertion that Demosthenes derived his skill in oratory from his study of the precepts of Aristotle. Now he is aroused by the renewal of the old claim¹ of the philosophers that Plato had surpassed all others in writing and speaking and should be taken as the standard for the simple style of the dialogue and also for the more vigorous style of public address,² in fact, that he not only stood first among the philosophers, but as an orator outshone even Demosthenes in his own field. For Plato's simpler style in the colloquial parts of the dialogues Dionysius has only words of commendation,³ but his criticisms of Plato's supposed attempts at oratory are severe and in some instances betray a lack of appreciation of the spirit in which Plato composed them.⁴ To speak in his own terminology, Dionysius is sometimes guilty of condemning Plato's *δύναμις* before he has gained an adequate conception of his *προαίρεσις*.

But in spite of the occasional thrust, it is evident that Dionysius tried to avoid giving to the essay a polemical cast and endeavored to present the appearance of studied impartiality.⁵ In order to give to the work the form of a logical demonstration, he had recourse to the doctrine of the three types of style. His method of proof is that of elimination. If the prose authors be divided into three groups according to style, and the best author, or authors, in each group be selected, it is then necessary merely to show that a given author is superior to each of these foremost representatives in order to demonstrate his superiority over them and all others in the given groups. Accordingly he endeavors to show that Demosthenes is superior to Thucydides, the representative of the elevated style, to Lysias, the representative of the plain style, and

¹Cf. Cicero *Orator* 62; *Brutus* 121.

²*De Dem.* 178. 8. 1024: καὶ μάλιστα ἐπεὶ τινες ἀξιοῦσι πάντων αὐτὸν ἀποφαίνειν φιλοσόφων τε καὶ ῥητόρων ἐρμηνεύσαι τὰ πράγματα δαιμονιώτατον παρακαλεῖν τὰ ἡμῶν δρᾶ καὶ κάνονι χρῆσθαι καθαρῶν ἅμα καὶ ἰσχυρῶν λόγων τούτῳ τῷ ἀνδρὶ.

³Cf. *De Dem.* 178. 21. 1025; 179. 8. 1025; 138. 18. 967.

⁴Doubtless much of this criticism goes back to those earlier critics of Plato to whom he refers in chap. v and whom he names in the *Epistle to Pompeius* (*De Pomp.* 226. 12. 757). viz.: Cephisodorus, Theopompus, Zoilus, Hippodamas, and Demetrius.

⁵Cf. 179. 18. 1026; *Ad. Pomp.* 222. 11. 752.

to Isocrates and Plato, the representatives of the middle, or mixed style.

The essay, as has already been stated, is argumentative rather than didactic, and in it Dionysius is interested primarily in establishing the pre-eminence of Demosthenes. All considerations of sources or historical relationships are subordinated to this main purpose. With this in mind we can now interpret his single reference to Isaeus: *πορεύσομαι δ' ἐπὶ τὸν Δημοσθένην, οὗ δὴ χάριν τοὺς τε χαρακτήρας τῆς λέξεως, οὓς ἡγούμην εἶναι κρατίστους, καὶ τοὺς δυναστεύσαντας ἐν αὐτοῖς κατηριθμησάμην, οὐχ ἅπαντας· Ἀντιφῶν γὰρ δὴ καὶ Θεόδωρος καὶ Πολυκράτης Ἰσαῖός τε καὶ Ζωῖλος καὶ Ἀναξιμένης καὶ οἱ κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς γενόμενοι τούτοις χρόνους οὐθὲν οὔτε καινὸν οὔτε περιττὸν ἐπετήδευσαν, ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν χαρακτήρων καὶ παρὰ τούτους τοὺς κανόνας τὰς ἑαυτῶν λέξεις κατεσκεύασαν* (*De Dem.* 143. 2. 974). The historical point of view has been abandoned, and in the whole field of prose literature Dionysius sees three types of style (*χαρακτῆρες τῆς λέξεως*), each with its own representatives. Among these leaders, Isaeus has no claim to prominence and may be disregarded in the demonstration of the primacy of Demosthenes. The expression *οὐθὲν οὔτε καινὸν οὔτε περιττὸν* is not to be taken absolutely, but is to be interpreted in the light of the context and of the underlying purpose of the essay. So far as it was a question of the three styles without regard to their development, Isaeus presented nothing novel. His historical relation to Demosthenes is neither affirmed nor denied.

What has been said up to this point with reference to this essay on Demosthenes applies only to the first part, which ends with chap. xxxiv. This section of the essay has a certain completeness in itself, as is indicated by the last sentence in chap. xxxii (*De Dem.* 202. 5. 1058): *βούλομαι δὲ δὴ καὶ συλλογίσασθαι τὰ εἰρημένα ἐξ ἀρχῆς καὶ δεῖξαι πάνθ', ὅσα ὑπεσχόμεν ἀρχόμενος τῆς θεωρίας τοῦ λεκτικοῦ τόπου, πεποιηκότα ἑμαυτόν.* The opening sentence of chap. xxxiv¹ shows that this treatment of Demosthenes from the standpoint of style (*λεκτικὸς τόπος*) was to be followed immedi-

¹ *De Dem.* 203. 22. 1060: *ὀλίγα τούτοις ἔτι προσθεῖς περὶ τῆς λέξεως, ἐπὶ τὸ καταλειπόμενον τῆς . . . θεωρίας μέρος μεταβήσομαι.* By comparing this passage with the one quoted above, it will be seen that *τὸ καταλειπόμενον μέρος* must refer to the *πραγματικὸν μέρος*.

ately by a treatment of his subject-matter (πραγματικὸς τόπος), as was Dionysius' practice in other essays. But instead of proceeding with this topic, in the following chapters he discussed at length the subject of "composition,"¹ which belongs under the λεκτικὸς τόπος. For some reason the proposed treatment was abandoned or deferred, and a new topic was substituted in its place.

Blass² in his earliest published work called attention to the fact that this essay on Demosthenes contained two references to the essay on "Composition" (περὶ συνθέσεως ὀνομάτων), which would indicate that the *De compositione* was written before the *De Demosthene*, while the essay on "Composition" had one reference to the essay on Demosthenes, from which the opposite conclusion might be drawn.³ Blass attempted to solve the difficulty by suggesting that, after writing a part of the essay on Demosthenes, Dionysius laid it aside to write the essay on "Composition," and later returned to the essay on Demosthenes.⁴ He did not indicate any definite point where the essay on Demosthenes was broken off, nor did he have faith enough in his own hypothesis to place the *De compositione* between the *De Isaeo* and the *De Demosthene* when he gave his complete list of the extant works of Dionysius in their chronological order.⁵ Roessler⁶

¹This term refers both to the arrangement and to the structure of words, i. e. the arrangement of letters and syllables within the word.

²*De Dionysii Halicarnassensis scriptis rhetoricis*, Bonn, 1863.

³*De Dem.* 236. 11. 1106: τοὺς ὑπομνηματισμοὺς ἡμῶν λαβὼν, οὓς περὶ τῆς συνθέσεως πεπραγματεύμεθα; *ibid.* 239. 14. 1111: πίστεις ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῆς συνθέσεως γραφεῖσιν ἀποδεδωκώς; *De Comp.* 77. 8. 118: ἐν οἷς ἂν τὴν ὑψηλὴν καὶ περιττὴν καὶ ἐγκατάσκευον διώκη φράσιν, ὑπὲρ ὧν ἐτέρωθι μοι δηλοῦται σαφέστερον. Cf. *De Dem.* chaps. v, vi.

⁴"Postquam primam partem absolvit libri de Demosthene, ad opus de compositione conscribendum delatus vel rogatu Rufi vel alia de causa qualicumque, hoc primum fecit, deinde ad Demosthenem reversus est."—*Op. cit.*, p. 9.

⁵"Ordo igitur scriptorum adhuc manentium, si quis eum e temporis rationibus instituere velit, hic erit: (1) *Epistula ad Amm.* I, (2) *De compositione*, (3) *De oratoribus antiquis* (*De Lysia Isocrate Isaeo, De Demosthene*, . . .)."—*Ibid.*, p. 30.

⁶*Dionysii Halicarnensis scriptorum rhetoricorum fragmenta collegit, disposuit, praefatus est Car. Theod. Roessler*, Leipzig, 1873, p. 4: "Dionysius cum verba (p. 118 R.) ὑπὲρ ὧν ἐτέρωθι μοι δηλοῦται σαφέστερον conscriberet, non sine animi quadam alacritate se ipse ea jam intuebatur conficientem et exponentem, quae futuro demum tempore persecutus est." Blass in his review of this dissertation in the *Philologischer Anzeiger* V (1873). 353, rejects this interpretation and defends the use of the present for a perfect by referring to the general practice of using the present for the perfect in giving citations: "Cicero sagt, ὁ φιλόσοφος γράφει (*Ad Amm.* I. 263. 12. 729), δηλοῖ Φιλόχορος" (*ibid.* 267. 11. 734), etc.

attempted to remove the difficulty by interpreting the reference in *De compositione* as referring forward to *De Dem.*, which was not yet composed, making *δηλοῦται* a vivid use of the present which reaches into the future. Croiset¹ interprets the same passage as referring to later chapters of the *De compositione*. But there is an absence of any exact correspondence between the demands of the reference and the passages to which the reference is supposed to be made.

When, however, the fact is noted that the essay on Demosthenes naturally falls into two distinct parts, and its references to the essay on "Composition" are in the second part, while the reference in the latter essay is to the first part of the essay on Demosthenes, it is at once suggested that the essay on "Composition" belongs chronologically between the two parts of the essay on Demosthenes. If we place it in this position, the references in the second part of the *De Demosthene* refer back to the *De compositione* and the reference in the *De compositione* refers back to the first part of the *De Demosthene*. Thus we may at the same time satisfy all these references and find an explanation for the break in the structure of the essay on Demosthenes. At the point mentioned Dionysius laid aside his work on Demosthenes in order to prepare the essay on "Composition," which was to serve as a birthday gift (*De comp.* 3. 5. 1) to his pupil, Rufus Metilius. While working on this essay, by a new combination of old material he wrought out a systematic treatment, which marked an important advance in his treatment of the subject of *σύνθεσις*. With this new knowledge he returned to the essay on Demosthenes and, instead of completing it according to the original plan, he restated his doctrine of "composition" and applied it to Demosthenes.

The purpose of the second half of the essay, as is stated by Dionysius in chap. xxxvi, was first to show what was the *χαρακτήρ* of the "composition," or "harmony" of Demosthenes, secondly, what means he employed to secure this *χαρακτήρ*, and thirdly, by what signs his peculiar *χαρακτήρ* could be distinguished from that

¹ *Histoire de la littérature grecque* V, p. 361, footnote: "Le ch. xi du π. σύνθεσ. se réfère, selon moi, aux ch. xxi et suivants du même ouvrage."

of other writers.¹ The first topic he treats in chaps. xxxvii–xli, the second in chaps. xlvii–xlix, and the third in chap. l. Here then we no longer have argument but exposition. In the first half of the essay Dionysius introduced the three types of style as a means of demonstrating the primacy of Demosthenes. But in the second half he discusses the three types of “composition,” or “harmony,” for the purpose of making clear the meaning of the terms which he employs in describing the “composition” of Demosthenes and for giving to the treatment greater educational value.² After describing the three types of “composition” and naming their foremost representatives he quotes a passage from Thucydides to illustrate the severe (*αὐστηρά*) type of “composition,” a passage from Isocrates to illustrate the smooth (*γλαφυρά*) type, and a passage from Herodotus to illustrate the middle, or mixed type. But there is no attempt at comparison between Demosthenes and the authors that are quoted. He does not even try to demonstrate the superiority of Demosthenes over the other orators, but contents himself saying that everybody, even his rival Aeschines, granted that. Any comparison with Plato is carefully avoided.³

This composite essay now contained much material that was not found in the earlier essay on Demosthenes and introduced new methods of approach to the orators in general. Dionysius' earlier treatment of style, as we see it exemplified in the essays on Lysias, Isocrates, and Isaeus, was based principally on the doctrine of the qualities (*ἀρεταί*) of style. This did not admit of a division between choice of words and “composition” and led to a somewhat meager treatment of the latter topic. Furthermore, the earlier essays, limited as they were in scope, failed to give a view of the relative position of the orators in the general literature of

¹ *De Dem.* 208. 6. 1066: *τίς δὲ ὁ τῆς ἁρμονίας αὐτοῦ χαρακτήρ καὶ ἀπὸ ποίας γέγονεν ἐπιτηδεύσεως τοιοῦτος καὶ πῶς ἂν τις αὐτὸν διαγνῶιη παρεξετάζων ἑτέροις, ταῦτ' ἐπειράσομαι λέγειν.*

² *De Dem.* 223. 13. 1087: *ἔν' ἐπειδὴν ἀποφαίνωμαι γνώμην ὅτι τὴν μέσσην τε καὶ μικτὴν ἁρμονίαν ἐπετηδένευσεν ὁ Δημοσθένης, μηδεὶς ὑποτυγχάνη μοι ταῦτα λέγων· αἱ γὰρ ἄραι τίνες εἰσὶν ἁρμονίαι; καὶ τίς αὐτῶν ἑκατέρας ἢ φύσις καὶ τίς ἡ μῖξις ἣ ἡ κράσις αὐτῆς; οὐδὲν γὰρ δὴ τῶν . . . ἄκρων.' τοῦτου μὲν δὴ πρῶτον χάριν, ὥσπερ ἔφην, ἐκεῖνα ἡναγκάσθην προεῖπείν, ἔπειτα, ἵνα μοι μὴ μονόκωλος ἢ μηδὲ αὐστηρὸς ὁ λόγος, ἀλλ' ἔχῃ τινὰς εὐπαιδευτοὺς διαγωγάς.*

³ Cf. *De Dem.* 233. 9. 1087.

the time. This new matter made the later essay on Demosthenes a valuable supplement to the preceding essays in the *De oratoribus antiquis*. In length it is equal to the first *σύνταξις* of that work and was probably added as a third *σύνταξις*,¹ although later, owing to the greater interest of the material which it contained, it displaced the second *σύνταξις*, which disappeared from circulation. That this essay on Demosthenes was incorporated into the *De oratoribus antiquis* by Dionysius is shown by two references in his own works. In the *Epistle to Pompeius*, which was written in reply to some criticisms which he had received with reference to his treatment of Plato in this essay, Dionysius quotes *De Dem.* 136. 11. 965—139. 20. 969 as being ἐν τῇ περὶ τῶν Ἀττικῶν πραγματεία ῥητόρων (*Ad Pomp.* 226. 22. 758), and in the *Second Epistle to Ammaeus* he refers to his discussion of Thucydides: ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων ῥητόρων πρὸς τὸ σὸν ὄνομα συνταχθείσιν ὑπομνηματισμοῖς (*Ad Amm.* II. 421. 9. 789).

The lack of uniformity in the terms which Dionysius uses for referring to his work on the orators is significant as indicating the loose and flexible nature of its structure. Besides the two passages just quoted, there is but one other direct reference to this collection in the works of Dionysius. In the opening sentence of the essay on Dinarchus he speaks of his treatment of certain orators: ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων γραφεῖσιν, where ῥητόρων is to be supplied from the preceding ῥήτορος. Thus the collection of essays may be referred to as ἡ πραγματεία, τὰ ὑπομνηματισμὰ, or more freely, τὰ γραφέντα, and even περὶ τῶν Ἀττικῶν ῥητόρων alternates with περὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων ῥητόρων. Such freedom in the use of titles is not strange in view of the general nature of the subject of the work, nor is it a matter for surprise that such a work

¹Rabe, "Die rhetorischen Schriften des Dionys von Halicarnass," *Rheinisches Museum* XLVIII (1893). 149, maintained that Dionysius always used the word *σύνταξις* in the sense of a work that is composed of parts. "Also *σύνταξις* ist immer eine Art 'Sammelband,' mag derselbe nun in Bücher getheilt sein, wie bei Deinias (*Schol. Eur. Or.* 872 . . . Δεινίας ἐν θ' τῆς πρώτης συντάξεως), oder in solche Theile, wie bei Dionys (hier je 3 Kapitel?)." Among the passages which he cites is *De Dem.* 231. 19. 1099, πολλὸν γὰρ ἂν ἡ σύνταξις τὸ μῆκος λάβοι . . . ἐπάνευμι δ' οὖν ἐπὶ τὰ λοιπά, ὧν ἐν ἀρχῇ προὔθεμην εἶναι. But the context clearly shows that the *σύνταξις* here mentioned is none other than the single essay on Demosthenes, which was then drawing toward its close. One may well question the application of Rabe's definition to *De or. ant.* 6. 4. 449; *De Thuc.* 334. 4. 823; *Ad Pomp.* 224. 3. 754, etc.

received an additional section which was not provided for in the original plan.

Three typical hypotheses with various modifications in details have been suggested for explaining the composition of the *De oratoribus antiquis*. Blass¹ held that in the latter part of the work Dionysius discussed Demosthenes, Aeschines, and Hyperides and that the *De Demosthene* formed a part of the treatment of Demosthenes, being followed by another essay in which Demosthenes was treated from the standpoint of subject-matter. The objections to any hypothesis that makes *De Dem.* follow the essay on Isaeus as a part of the same series have already been shown. Wilamowitz² has suggested that Dionysius abandoned his plan for six essays when he entered upon his treatment of Demosthenes and that the *De Dem.* completed the series. This is open to the same objections as the hypothesis of Blass, and, furthermore, it disregards the passage in the *De Dinarcho* and other evidence which indicate that the original plan was actually carried out. Croiset³ felt the difficulty of making *De Dem.* harmonize with the essays on Lysias, Isocrates, and Isaeus and attempted to solve the difficulty by assuming that *De Dem.* was an independent essay but contained portions of an earlier essay on Demosthenes which had formed a part of the *De oratoribus antiquis*. But this hypothesis gives us little relief because it is the sections treating of Plato and Thucydides, referred to elsewhere by Dionysius, which afford Croiset evidence for the existence of an earlier essay, and which, according to the hypothesis, must have been in that essay. But these are the very elements which are foreign to the general scope of *De or. ant.* and should not be found there.

The hypothesis here presented—that the extant essay on Demosthenes is a later work which was afterward incorporated into the *De oratoribus antiquis*—affords a basis for explaining the

¹Blass *De Dion. Hal. script. rhet.*, pp. 10 ff.

²Wilamowitz "Lesefrüchte," *Rh. Mus.* XXXIV. 626.

³Croiset, *Hist. de la lit. grec.* V. 363 ff. In the reference to Lysias in *De Dem.* 130. 19. 956: *τίς δὲ ἦν ἡ προαίρεσις αὐτοῦ καὶ τίς ἡ δύναμις, ἐν τῇ πρὸ ταύτης δεδήλωται γραφή*, the word *γραφή* is to be taken as referring to the collection of six essays rather than to the first three, for which Dionysius uses the term *σύνταξις*.

peculiar nature of the contents of that essay and satisfies the references to it in other works of Dionysius. According to this hypothesis, we are to suppose that the *De oratoribus antiquis* at first contained two sections (*συντάξεις*); that later a third was added which contained a new presentation of the stylistic merits of Demosthenes and proof of his pre-eminence that still later, probably after the death of Dionysius, the second section, containing the essays on Demosthenes, Aeschines, and Hyperides, ceased to be copied and disappear from circulation, because in these Dionysius had followed the same method of treatment that he employed in the first section with consequent monotony arising from its repeated application. Thus the essays in the first section on Lysias, Isocrates, and Isaeus together with the later essay on Demosthenes served as a sort of compendium, illustrating Dionysius' methods of treating the orators and containing his views with regard to the most important of them.

RALPH HERMON TUKEY

NEW HAVEN, CONN.